

REMARKS

Claims 1-59 are presented for examination. Claims 1 and 23 were amended to add formalities required by the Office for program product claims. Additionally, the word “single” was added to modify the electronic form to be displayed. Note that the single form could include multiple screens, but they are all associated with a single order form. Additionally, the limitation “displaying a selection designator to allow a user to select either the store organization or the item organization for the display;” was added to independent claims 23, 45 and 55. Additionally, the last two claim elements in independent claims 23, 45 and 55 have been removed and placed in newly added dependent claims 57-59. Dependent claim 25, 47 and 56 have been cancelled without prejudice. Various additional amendments have been made to the claims.

The rejections set forth in the Office Action are traversed in their entirety.

Various claims including independent claims 1, 26 and 48 and various dependent claims were rejected in the Office Action under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Schleicher (20030115119). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The claims are directed to a program product, system and method for creating a display of an electronic order form with specific characteristics. Those characteristics, in the case of claims 1 and 23 are “a display option to the buyer to generate an order to a supplier for an individual store only or to order for a plurality of stores of the buyer;” and “if an order is to be generated for a plurality of stores of the buyer, displaying a single electronic order form for generating an order for the plurality of different stores associated with the buyer system ID, wherein a designation for each of the plurality of the stores is displayed, with each different store having a separate order amount field.”

Paragraphs 0049-0053 are referenced in the Office Action for disclosing the claimed features. Specifically, paragraphs 0049-0050 relate to multiple trading partner buyers dropping off purchase orders with a distributor which are then mapped to a standard purchase

order format. Paragraphs 0051-0053 disclose multiple purchase orders existing within a document, which are then “extracted out and put individually into the message queue that starts a new purchase order process per document 506.” This not only does not disclose using a single electronic order form for purchasing for multiple stores of a buyer, but teaches away from it. There is no disclosure in the reference of a display claim element “wherein a designation for each of the plurality of the stores is displayed, with each different store having a separate order amount field.” Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection by withdrawn.

Various claims including independent claims 23, 45 and 55 and various dependent claims were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Schleicher in view of Yehia (US 2002/0147726). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The independent claims 23, 45 and 55 are directed to generating a single electronic order form for a plurality of stores associated with a buyer system ID, the display “selectable between displaying each of a plurality of different fulfillment sections in the fulfillment electronic order form associated with a different store from a group of stores associated with that buyer system ID and listing in the fulfillment section the one or more items ordered for that store and with each different listed item in the fulfillment section having at least one parameter field to be populated (a store organization), or associated with a different item ordered from the supplier and listing in the fulfillment section the stores associated with that buyer system ID that are being supplied with that item and with each different listed item in the fulfillment section having at least one parameter field to be populated (an item organization).”

Yehia does not disclose such a “selectable” option, much less the organization by stores associated with a single buyer system ID. It is noted that the Office Action at page 10 states that Official Notice is taken that displaying “purchaseable products by brand/supplier or by item categories” is well known. However, the claims do not refer to displaying by brand/supplier. Rather, the claim calls for displaying a “plurality of different fulfillment sections in the fulfillment electronic order form associated with a different store from a group of stores associated with that buyer system ID.” In other words, the display relates to buyer facilities, not suppliers. Likewise, the other selectable option is for the

display of each item to be ordered in a different fulfillment section, "and listing in the fulfillment section the stores associated with that buyer system ID that are being supplied with that item." These features are not disclosed in Yehia.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn and the application passed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 11, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By



William T. Ellis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,874